arXiv:1210.0256v1 [math.DG] 30 Sep 2012

ON STABILITY OF THE p-AFFINE ISOPERIMETRIC INEQUALITY

MOHAMMAD N. IVAKI

Abstract. Employing the affine normal flow, we prove a stability version of the p-affine isoperimetric inequality, $p \geq 1$, in $\mathbb{R}^2$ in the class of smooth, origin-symmetric convex bodies. That is, if K is a smooth, origin-symmetric convex body in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that it has volume π and its p-affine perimeter is close enough to the one of an ellipse with the same volume, then, after applying a special linear transformation, K is close to an ellipse in the Hausdorff distance.

1. Introduction

The setting for this paper is the n-dimensional Euclidean space, $\mathbb{R}^n$. A compact convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with non-empty interior is called a *convex body*.

Let Φ be a real valued function on convex bodies. Given a geometric inequality $\Phi(K) \geq 0$, for every convex body K and with the equality case obtained only for a certain family of convex bodies, denoted by $\mathcal{F}$, a *stability* version of Φ concerns the following question. Find a positive constant ε_0, and a positive function f, such that the following holds: If for some $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ we have

$$\Phi(K) \leq \varepsilon,$$

then there exists a convex body in $\mathcal{F}$, denoted by L, such that

$$d(K, L) \leq f(\varepsilon),$$

where $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ is an appropriate norm in the context of the geometric inequality. Here f obeys the rule $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} f(\varepsilon) = 0$ (see the beautiful survey of H. Groemer [15]).

Versions of stability have been investigated for several important inequalities, including a stability version of the Brunn-Minkowski inequality due to V.I. Diskant [12], stability of the Rogers-Shephard inequality by K.J. Böröczky [9], stability of the Blashcke-Santaló inequality and the affine isoperimetric inequality in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for $n \geq 3$ by K.J. Böröczky [10], stability of the reverse Blaschke-Santaló inequality by K.J. Böröczky and D. Hug [8], stability of the Prékopa-Leindler inequality by K. Ball, and K.J. Böröczky [4], stability of a volume ratio by D. Hug, and R. Schneider [14], and recently stability of the functional forms of the Blashcke-Santaló inequality by F. Barthe, K.J. Böröczky and M. Fradelizi [6]. Our aim in this paper is to prove a stability version of the p-affine isoperimetric inequality, $p \geq 1$, in $\mathbb{R}^2$ in the class of smooth, origin-symmetric convex bodies.

Date: October 2, 2012.

Key words and phrases. affine support function, affine normal flow, Hausdorff distance, stability of geometric inequalities, p-affine surface area, p-affine isoperimetric inequality.

In his seminal work [24, 25], E. Lutwak extended the theory of Brunn-Minkowski to Brunn-Minkowski-Firey theory, resulting impressive outcomes in convex geometry [26, 27, 28, 29], stochastic geometry [16, 17], differential geometry and differential equations [11, 18, 23, 41, 42, 43, 44]. One of these developments was generalizing the notion of the affine surface area to p-affine surface areas, for $p > 1$. Subsequently, the notion of p-affine surface areas for $0 < p < 1$ has been introduced by D. Hug [13], for $-n < p < 0$ by M. Meyer and E. Werner [30] and for all $p \neq -n$ by C. Shütt and E. Werner in [32]. Later, in [21, 22] it was observed by M. Ludwig that p-affine surface areas, $p \neq -n$, belong to a larger family, called ϕ-affine surface area. For $p \geq 1$, the p-affine surface area of a convex body is related to the volume of the convex body by the p-affine isoperimetric inequality. For $p = 1$, this is the well-known affine isoperimetric inequality due to W. Blaschke with the equality case characterized in the class of convex bodies with C^2 boundary [7]. The characterization of the equality in general is due to C.M. Petty [31]. The p-affine isoperimetric inequality, for $p > 1$, was proved by E. Lutwak [25], including characterizing the equality case. The equality in the p-affine isoperimetric inequality is achieved only for ellipsoids centred at the origin.

A stability version of the affine isoperimetric inequality, $p = 1$, was presented by K.J. Böröczky, in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for $n \geq 3$, [10]. He proved if K is a convex body in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that its affine surface is ε-close to the one of an ellipsoid, for a fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, then K is "close" to the unit ball in the Banach-Mazur distance. Here "close" is an approximation of order $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{6n}} |\log \varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{6n}}$. Later in [5], the order of approximation was improved to $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3(n+1)}} |\log \varepsilon|^{\frac{4}{3(n+1)}}$. The case $n = 2$ was not addressed neither in [5] nor in [10]. In this paper we prove a version of stability of the p-affine isoperimetric inequality, $p \geq 1$, in the class of smooth, origin-symmetric convex bodies in $\mathbb{R}^2$. The technique presented here to deal with stability is new as it approaches the problem from the perspective of geometric flows and ODEs. However, the interaction between convex geometry and geometric flows is not new. There are several important contributions of geometric flows to convex geometry. A proof of the affine isoperimetric inequality by B. Andrews using the affine normal flow [1], necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a solution to the discrete L_0-Minkowski problem, using discrete weighted curve shortening flow, by A. Stancu [34, 35, 38] and independently by B. Andrews [3] and a proof of the p-affine isoperimetric inequality in the class of origin-symmetric convex bodies in $\mathbb{R}^2$ using the affine normal [18]. See [36, 37, 39, 40] for more applications of flows. In particular, a newly defined family of centro-affine p-flows and their applications to centro-affine differential geometry by A. Stancu [39, 40].

Let K be a convex body. The support function of K, denoted by s_K, is defined by

$$s_K : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$$
$$s_K(x) = \max_{y \in K} \langle x, y \rangle,$$

where $\langle x, y \rangle$ denotes the standard inner product of x and y. Let K be a strictly convex body, having origin in its interior, smoothly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let

$$x_K : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}^n,$$

be the Gauss parametrization of ∂K, the boundary of K. The support function of K has the following simple form

$$s_K(z) := \langle x_K(z), z\rangle,$$

for each $z \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. We denote the matrix of the radius of curvatures of ∂K by $\mathfrak{r} = [\mathfrak{r}_{ij}]_{1\leq i,j\leq n-1}$, the entries of $\mathfrak{r}$ are considered as functions on the unit sphere. And they are related to the support function by

$$\mathfrak{r}_{ij} := \bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j s + s\bar{g}_{ij},$$

where $\bar{g}_{ij}$ is the standard metric on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $\bar{\nabla}$ is the standard Levi-Civita connection of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. We denote the Gauss curvature of ∂K by $\mathcal{K}$ and remark that, as a function on the unit sphere, it is related to the support function of the convex body by

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{K}} := \det_{\bar{g}}(\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j s + \bar{g}_{ij}s) := \frac{\det \mathfrak{r}_{ij}}{\det \bar{g}_{ij}}.$$

Furthermore, the affine support function of K, denoted by σ, is defined by

$$\sigma = \frac{s}{\mathcal{K}^{1/(n+1)}}.$$

For $p \geq 1$, the p-affine surface area of K is defined by

$$\Omega_p(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{s}{\mathcal{K}}\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+1}}\right)^{\frac{p}{n+p}} d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}},$$

where $\mu_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}$ is the standard Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. The p-affine surface area of a convex body is bounded by the volume via the p-affine isoperimetric inequality. If the centroid of K is at the origin then

$$\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{n+p}(K)}{n^{n+p}V^{n-p}(K)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \omega_n^2,$$

with the equality case only for ellipsoids centred at the origin. Here $V(K)$ is the volume of K defined by $V(K) = \frac{1}{n}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{s}{\mathcal{K}} d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}$ and ω_n is the volume of the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$. We call the quantity $\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{n+p}(K)}{n^{n+p}V^{n-p}(K)}\right)^{1/p}$ the p-affine isoperimetric ratio of K. In $\mathbb{R}^2$ it is more appropriate to use the notation $A(K)$ instead of $V(K)$ for the surface area of K.

We mention here that thanks to a theorem of A.D. Alexandrov (see P.M. Gruber [17], page 22), the boundary of a convex body is twice differentiable in a generalized sense at almost everywhere with respect to its Hausdorff measure. Therefore, a generalized notion of Gauss curvature is available for convex bodies which are not necessary smooth. This in turn implies that the formula above of the p-affine surface area can be extended by

$$\Omega_p(K) = \int_{\partial K} s\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+1}}\right)^{\frac{p}{n+p}} dx,$$

for any convex body K in $\mathbb{R}^n$, having origin in its interior such that when K is smooth then these two definitions coincide.

Let K and L be two convex bodies in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with respective support functions s_K and s_L. Then the Hausdorff distance between K and L is defined by

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(K, L) = \max_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |s_K - s_L|.$$

In what follows we mainly work in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Without loss of generality, using John's lemma [20], if necessary, we can assume that $c_1 \leq s_K \leq c_2$ for universal constants c_1 and c_2, depending only on $A(K)$.

Theorem 1.1 (Main Theorem). *Let $p \geq 1$. There exists an $\varepsilon_p > 0$, depending on p, such that the following holds. Let K be an origin-symmetric convex body, smoothly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with volume π. If for an $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_p$*

$$\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K)}{2^{2+p}A^{2-p}(K)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} > \pi^2(1-\varepsilon),$$

then there exist a disk $\mathcal{D}$, an ellipse $\mathcal{E}$ and a special linear transformation T such that

$$\mathcal{E} \subseteq TK \subseteq \left(1 + \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{2c_2}{c_1^2} \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{10}}\right)\mathcal{D},$$

and

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\mathcal{E}, \left(1 + \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{2c_2}{c_1^2} \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{10}}\right)\mathcal{D}\right) < C_p \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{10}},$$

for a universal constant C_p.
In particular,

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(TK, \mathcal{E}\right) < C_p \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{10}}.$$

To prove this theorem we will implement the affine normal flow on curves. We only use results on the short time behavior of this flow. Let K be a compact, origin-symmetric, strictly convex body, smoothly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^2$. We denote the space of such convex bodies by $\mathcal{K}_{sym}$. Let

$$x_K : \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{R}^2,$$

be the Gauss parametrization of ∂K, the boundary of $K \in \mathcal{K}_{sym}$, where the origin of the plane is chosen to coincide with the center of symmetry of the body. We denote the curvature of ∂K by κ. As a functions on the unit circle it is related to the support function by

$$\frac{1}{\kappa}(z) := s_{\theta\theta}(z) + s(z),$$

where θ is the angle parameter on $\mathbb{S}^1$. Let $K_0 := K \in \mathcal{K}_{sym}$. We consider a family $\{K_t\} \in \mathcal{K}_{sym}$, and their associated smooth embeddings $x : \mathbb{S}^1 \times [0, T) \to \mathbb{R}^2$, which are evolving according to the affine flow, namely,

$$\partial_t x := -\kappa^{\frac{1}{3}}\, z,\ x(\cdot, 0) = x_{K_0}(\cdot),\ x(\cdot, t) = x_{K_t}(\cdot). \tag{1.1}$$

The well-known affine normal flow, was addressed by G. Sapiro and A. Tannenbaum [33] and by B. Andrews in more generality [1, 2]. Andrews, investigated affine normal flow of hypersurfaces in any dimension and showed that the volume preserving flow evolves any convex initial bounded open set, not necessarily smooth, exponentially fast, in the $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ topology, to an ellipsoid, [2].

We point out here that smoothness of K in the statement of our main Theorem is *not* necessary. The reason is the stantaneous smoothing property of the affine normal flow [2] and monotonicity of the p-affine isoperimetric inequality along the affine normal flow [18].

2. Stability of the p-affine isoperimetric inequality

Throughout this section we assume that $K_0 = K$ is smooth and $A(K) = \pi$.

2.1. Preliminaries.

We list several lemmas and a theorem necessary for our proof of the main Theorem.

Lemma 2.1 (Evolution equation of the area)**.** *As $\{K_t\}$ evolve by evolution equation (1.1) then $A(K_t)$ evolves by $\frac{d}{dt}A(K_t) = -\Omega_1(K_t)$. In particular, $A(K_t)$ is decreasing.*

We recall the following affine isoperimetric type inequalities involving time derivative of Ω_p from Lemma 6.1 in [18] along the affine normal flow.

Lemma 2.2 (Ω_p along the affine normal flow)**.** [18] *The following affine isoperimetric inequalities hold along the affine normal flow.*
If $1 \le p \le 2$, then

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Omega_p(K_t) \ge \frac{p-2}{p+2}\frac{\Omega_p(K_t)\Omega_1(K_t)}{A(K_t)} + \frac{2(p-1)(4p^2+3p+2)}{(p+2)^3}\int_{\partial K_t} \sigma^{-1-\frac{3p}{p+2}}\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}^2 d\mathfrak{s},$$

while, if $p \ge 2$, we then have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Omega_p(K_t) \ge \frac{p-2}{p+2}\frac{\Omega_p(K_t)\Omega_1(K_t)}{A(K_t)} + \frac{6p}{(p+2)^2}\int_{\partial K_t} \sigma^{-1-\frac{3p}{p+2}}\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}^2 d\mathfrak{s}.$$

Here, $\mathfrak{s}$ is the affine arc-length of the evolving boundary curve ∂K_t.

Lemma 2.3 (Stability of the affine support function)**.** [18] *Suppose that K is a convex body in $\mathcal{K}_{sym}$. Denote the curvature and the support function of ∂K respectively by κ and s. If, for all θ: $m \le \frac{s}{\kappa^{1/3}} \le M$ for some positive numbers m and M, then there exist two ellipses $\mathcal{E}_{in}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{out}$ such that $\mathcal{E}_{in} \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{out}$ and*

$$\frac{s}{\kappa^{1/3}}(\mathcal{E}_{in}) = m,\ \frac{s}{\kappa^{1/3}}(\mathcal{E}_{out}) = M.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let K be an origin-symmetric, smooth convex body with area π. Then*

$$\min_{\partial K}\frac{s}{\kappa^{1/3}} \le 1 \le \max_{\partial K}\frac{s}{\kappa^{1/3}}.$$

Proof. The claim follows from Lemma 2.3: If $\min\limits_{\partial K}\frac{s}{\kappa^{1/3}} > 1$, then there is an ellipse which is contained in K and has the area $\pi\left(\min\limits_{\partial K}\frac{s}{\kappa^{1/3}}\right)^{3/2} > \pi$. Similarly, if $\max\limits_{\partial K}\frac{s}{\kappa^{1/3}} < 1$, then there is an ellipse which contains K and has the area $\pi\left(\max\limits_{\partial K}\frac{s}{\kappa^{1/3}}\right)^{3/2} < \pi$. In both cases we reach to a contradiction as the area of K is π. □

We state the following important Theorem 5 from [2].

Theorem 2.5 (Controlling Hausdorff distance I)**.** [2] *Let $\{K_t\}$ be a smooth, strictly convex solution $\{K_t\}$ of evolution equation (1.1). Then*

$$s(z,t) \ge s(z,0) - \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\frac{c_2}{c_1}t^{\frac{3}{4}},$$

for $t \in \left(0, \frac{3}{4}c_1^{\frac{4}{3}}\right)$. *In particular,*

$$K \subseteq K_t + \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{c_2}{c_1} t^{\frac{3}{4}} B_1$$

for $t \in \left(0, \frac{3}{4}c_1^{\frac{4}{3}}\right)$.

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be an ellipse. We denote its semi-minor and semi-major axes by $a_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $b_{\mathcal{E}}$, respectively. We also need the following simple lemma.

Lemma 2.6 (Controlling Hausdorff distance II)**.** *Let* $\mathcal{E}_1$ *be an ellipse and* $\mathcal{E}_2$ *be a disk both centered at the origin of the plane such that* $\mathcal{E}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{E}_2$. *Then we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2) \le \left(\frac{A(\mathcal{E}_2)}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{A(\mathcal{E}_1)}{\pi R_{\mathcal{E}_2}},$$

where $R_{\mathcal{E}_2}$ *is the radius of* $\mathcal{E}_2$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2) &\le R_{\mathcal{E}_2} - a_{\mathcal{E}_1} \\ &= \left(\frac{A(\mathcal{E}_2)}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{A(\mathcal{E}_1)}{\pi b_{\mathcal{E}_1}} \\ &\le \left(\frac{A(\mathcal{E}_2)}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{A(\mathcal{E}_1)}{\pi R_{\mathcal{E}_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. □

2.2. **Proof of the main Theorem.** In this section we present a proof of the stability of the p-affine isoperimetric inequality.

Proof. Let $p > 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon_p < \frac{1}{2}$. The upper bound on ε_p will be determined later at the end of this section. Assume that

$$\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K)}{2^{2+p}A^{2-p}(K)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} > \pi^2(1-\varepsilon_p). \tag{2.1}$$

Then from Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.1 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K_t)}{A^{2-p}(K_t)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &= \frac{1}{p}\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K_t)}{A^{2-p}(K_t)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}-1} \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K_t)}{A^{2-p}(K_t)}\right) \\ &\ge d_p \left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K_t)}{A^{2-p}(K_t)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}-1} \frac{\Omega_p^{p+1}(K_t)}{A^{2-p}(K_t)} \int_{\partial K_t} \left(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}\right)_{\mathfrak{s}}^2 d\mathfrak{s} \\ &= \frac{d_p}{\Omega_p(K_t)}\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K_t)}{A^{2-p}(K_t)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \int_{\partial K_t} \left(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}\right)_{\mathfrak{s}}^2 d\mathfrak{s} \qquad (2.2) \end{aligned}$$

where d_p is defined as follows

$$d_p := \begin{cases} \frac{2(4p^2+3p+2)}{p(p-1)}, & \text{if } 1 < p \le 2, \\ \frac{6(p+2)}{(p-1)^2}, & \text{if } p \ge 2. \end{cases}$$

We integrate of both sides of the inequality (2.2) on the time interval $[0,\delta]$ with respect to dt.

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\delta \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K_t)}{A^{2-p}(K_t)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}dt &\geq \int_0^\delta \frac{d_p}{\Omega_p(K_t)}\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K_t)}{A^{2-p}(K_t)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\int_{\partial K_t}\left(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}\right)_{\mathfrak{s}}^2 d\mathfrak{s}dt\\ &\geq \int_0^\delta \min_{t\in[0,\delta]}\left(\frac{d_p}{\Omega_p(K_t)}\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K_t)}{A^{2-p}(K_t)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\int_{\partial K_t}\left(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}\right)_{\mathfrak{s}}^2 d\mathfrak{s}\right)dt\\ &= \frac{d_p\delta}{\Omega_p(K_{t_*})}\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K_{t_*})}{A^{2-p}(K_{t_*})}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\int_{\partial K_{t_*}}\left(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}\right)_{\mathfrak{s}}^2 d\mathfrak{s}\end{aligned}$$

where t_* is the time that $\min\limits_{t\in[0,\delta]}\frac{1}{\Omega_p(K_t)}\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K_t)}{A^{2-p}(K_t)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\int_{\partial K_t}\left(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}\right)_{\mathfrak{s}}^2 d\mathfrak{s}$ is achieved. Therefore, using Hölder inequality we find

$$2^{\frac{p+2}{p}}\pi^2\varepsilon_p \geq \frac{d_p\delta}{\Omega_1(K_{t_*})\Omega_p(K_{t_*})}\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K_{t_*})}{A^{2-p}(K_{t_*})}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(\sigma_M^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}(t_*)-\sigma_m^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}(t_*)\right)^2.$$

Here, $\sigma_M^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}(t_*)$ and $\sigma_m^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}(t_*)$ are, respectively, the maximum and the minimum of $\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}$ on ∂K_{t_*}. It follows that

(2.3)
$$\sqrt{\frac{2^{\frac{p+2}{p}}\pi^2\Omega_1(K_{t_*})\Omega_p(K_{t_*})\varepsilon_p}{d_p\delta}} \geq \left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K_{t_*})}{A^{2-p}(K_{t_*})}\right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}\left(\sigma_M^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}(t_*)-\sigma_m^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}(t_*)\right).$$

To bound $\Omega_1(K_{t_*})\Omega_p(K_{t_*})$ from above we need to consider two cases. Let $1<p\leq 2$. By Lemma 2.1 we have $A(K_{t_*})\leq A(K)=\pi$. Therefore, by the affine isoperimetric inequality and the p-affine isoperimetric inequality we infer that

$$\Omega_1(K_{t_*})\leq 2\pi^{\frac{2}{3}}A^{\frac{1}{3}}(K_{t_*})\leq 2\pi,$$

$$\Omega_p(K_{t_*})\leq 2\pi^{\frac{2p}{p+2}}A^{\frac{2-p}{p+2}}(K_{t_*})\leq 2\pi,$$

and thus $\Omega_1(K_{t_*})\Omega_p(K_{t_*})\leq 4\pi^2$.

Now we proceed to deal with the case $p>2$. Recall from the evolution equation of the area, Lemma 2.1, that

$$\frac{d}{dt}A(K_t)=-\Omega_1(K_t)\geq -2\pi,$$

hence

$$A(K_\delta)\geq A(K)-2\pi\delta=\pi(1-2\delta).$$

If $\delta<\frac{1}{4}$ then $A(K_\delta)>\frac{\pi}{2}$. In particular, this yields that $A(K_{t_*})>\frac{\pi}{2}$. This observation combined by the p-affine isoperimetric inequality imply that

$$\Omega_p(K_{t_*})\leq 2\pi^{\frac{2p}{p+2}}A^{\frac{2-p}{p+2}}(K_{t_*})\leq 2^{\frac{2p}{p+2}}\pi.$$

As $\Omega_1(K_{t_*})\leq 2\pi$ we get $\Omega_1(K_{t_*})\Omega_p(K_{t_*})\leq 2^{\frac{2p+2}{p+2}}\pi^2<4\pi^2$. Consequently, assuming $\delta<\frac{1}{4}$ together with inequalities (2.1) and (2.3) yield

$$\left(\sigma_M^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}(t_*)-\sigma_m^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3p}{2(p+2)}}(t_*)\right)\leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}\pi}{\sqrt{d_p}}\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_p}{\delta}}.$$

Define $d'_p := \frac{2\sqrt{2}\pi}{\sqrt{d_p}}$. Multiplying K_{t_*} by a factor λ, depending on δ, where $\lambda \geq 1$ we can have $A(\lambda K_{t_*}) = \pi$. Note that $\lim\limits_{\delta\to 0}\lambda = 1$. In particular, by this assumption and Lemma 2.4 we have

$$1 \in \left[\lambda^{\frac{(1-p)}{3(p+2)}}\sigma_m^{\frac{1-p}{2+p}}(t_*), \lambda^{\frac{(1-p)}{3(p+2)}}\sigma_M^{\frac{1-p}{2+p}}(t_*)\right].$$

As a result,

$$\lambda^{\frac{4(1-p)}{3(p+2)}}\sigma_M^{\frac{1-p}{2+p}}(t_*) \leq d'_p\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_p}{\delta}} + 1,$$

and

$$\lambda^{\frac{4(1-p)}{3(p+2)}}\sigma_m^{\frac{1-p}{2+p}}(t_*) \geq 1 - d'_p\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_p}{\delta}}.$$

Let us assume for now that

$$1 - d'_p\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_p}{\delta}} > 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{1}{\left(1 + d'_p\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_p}{\delta}}\right)^{\frac{p+2}{p-1}}} \leq \lambda^{\frac{4}{3}}\sigma(t_*) \leq \frac{1}{\left(1 - d'_p\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_p}{\delta}}\right)^{\frac{p+2}{p-1}}}.$$

From the last inequality and Lemma 2.3 we deduce that there exist two ellipses, denoted by $\mathcal{E}_{in}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{out}$, such that

$$\mathcal{E}_{in} \subseteq K_{t_*} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{out}, \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{E}_{out}} = \frac{\lambda^{-\frac{4}{3}}}{\left(1 - d'_p\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_p}{\delta}}\right)^{\frac{p+2}{p-1}}},\ \sigma_{\mathcal{E}_{in}} = \frac{\lambda^{-\frac{4}{3}}}{\left(1 + d'_p\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_p}{\delta}}\right)^{\frac{p+2}{p-1}}}.$$

On the other hand, let us assume that $\delta < \frac{3}{4}c_1^{\frac{4}{3}}$, then by Theorem 2.5

$$K_{t_*} \subseteq K \subseteq K_{t_*} + \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\frac{c_2}{c_1}t_*^{\frac{3}{4}}B_1 \subseteq K_{t_*} + \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\frac{c_2}{c_1}\delta^{\frac{3}{4}}B_1. \tag{2.6}$$

Combining relations (2.5) and (2.6) we find

$$\mathcal{E}_{in} \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{out} + \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\frac{c_2}{c_1}\delta^{\frac{3}{4}}B_1.$$

Set $\delta := \varepsilon_p^{\frac{\beta}{2+\beta}}$, for a positive β, in the previous inequality. For $\varepsilon_p < \left(\frac{3}{4}c_1^{\frac{4}{3}}\right)^{\frac{2+\beta}{\beta}}$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{in} \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{out} + \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\frac{c_2}{c_1}\varepsilon_p^{\frac{3\beta}{4(2+\beta)}}B_1, \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{E}_{out}} = \frac{\lambda^{-\frac{4}{3}}}{\left(1 - d'_p\varepsilon_p^{\frac{1}{2+\beta}}\right)^{\frac{p+2}{p-1}}},\ \sigma_{\mathcal{E}_{in}} = \frac{\lambda^{-\frac{4}{3}}}{\left(1 + d'_p\varepsilon_p^{\frac{1}{2+\beta}}\right)^{\frac{p+2}{p-1}}}. \tag{2.8}$$

We now get back to the assumption (2.4). If we choose $\varepsilon_p < \left(\frac{1}{d'_p}\right)^{2+\beta}$ then

$$1 - d'_p \varepsilon_p^{\frac{1}{2+\beta}} > 0.$$

On the other hand, $\delta := \varepsilon_p^{\frac{\beta}{2+\beta}} < \frac{1}{4}$ and $\varepsilon_p < \left(\frac{3}{4}c_1^{\frac{4}{3}}\right)^{\frac{2+\beta}{\beta}}$. Therefore, choosing

$$\varepsilon_p < \min\left\{ \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{\frac{1+\beta}{\beta}}, \left(\frac{1}{d'_p}\right)^{2+\beta}, \left(\frac{3}{4}c_1^{\frac{4}{3}}\right)^{\frac{2+\beta}{\beta}} \right\}$$

guarantees that both assumptions (2.4) and (2.6) hold.

Recall that $B_{c_1} \subseteq K$. Therefore by an avoiding principle, $B_{c_1/2} \subseteq K_t$ for $t \in [0, \eta]$, for an η independent of K. Precisely, $\eta = \frac{3}{4}c_1^{\frac{4}{3}}\left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}}\right)$ is the time that B_{c_1} shrinks to $B_{c_1/2}$ under the affine normal flow. If we choose $\delta = \varepsilon_p^{\frac{\beta}{2+\beta}} < \eta$, then from (2.5) we get

$$B_{c_1/2} \subseteq K_{t_*} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{out}.$$

From this we conclude that, if

$$\varepsilon_p < \min\left\{ \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{\frac{1+\beta}{\beta}}, \left(\frac{1}{d'_p}\right)^{2+\beta}, \left(\frac{3}{4}c_1^{\frac{4}{3}}\right)^{\frac{2+\beta}{\beta}} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}}\right)^{\frac{(2+\beta)}{\beta}} \right\}$$

then,

$$\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{c_2}{c_1} \varepsilon_p^{\frac{3\beta}{4(2+\beta)}} B_1 = \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{2c_2}{c_1^2} \varepsilon_p^{\frac{3\beta}{4(2+\beta)}} B_{c_1/2} \subseteq \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{2c_2}{c_1^2} \varepsilon_p^{\frac{3\beta}{4(2+\beta)}} \mathcal{E}_{out}.$$

By (2.7) we find

$$\mathcal{E}_{in} \subseteq K \subseteq \left(1 + \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{2c_2}{c_1^2} \varepsilon_p^{\frac{3\beta}{4(2+\beta)}}\right) \mathcal{E}_{out}. \tag{2.9}$$

We apply a special linear transformation, $T \in SL(n)$, such that $T\mathcal{E}_{out}$ is a disk. Consequently, by relation (2.9) we get

$$T\mathcal{E}_{in} \subseteq TK \subseteq \left(1 + \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{2c_2}{c_1^2} \varepsilon_p^{\frac{3\beta}{4(2+\beta)}}\right) T\mathcal{E}_{out}. \tag{2.10}$$

Now from the facts that $\mathcal{E}_{in} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{out}$, σ is invariant under special linear transformations, Lemma 2.6, and identities in (2.8) and we have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(T\mathcal{E}_{in}, \left(1 + \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{2c_2}{c_1^2} \varepsilon_p^{\frac{3\beta}{4(2+\beta)}}\right) T\mathcal{E}_{out}\right) \leq \frac{\left(1 + \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{2c_2}{c_1^2} \varepsilon_p^{\frac{3\beta}{4(2+\beta)}}\right)^2 \sigma_{\mathcal{E}_{out}}^{\frac{3}{2}} - \sigma_{\mathcal{E}_{in}}^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\left(1 + \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{2c_2}{c_1^2} \varepsilon_p^{\frac{3\beta}{4(2+\beta)}}\right) \sigma_{\mathcal{E}_{out}}^{\frac{3}{4}}}.$$

Therefore $d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(T\mathcal{E}_{in}, \left(1+\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\frac{2c_2}{c_1^2}\varepsilon_p^{\frac{3\beta}{4(2+\beta)}}\right)T\mathcal{E}_{out}\right)$ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{\lambda}\frac{\left(1-d'_p\varepsilon_p^{\frac{1}{2+\beta}}\right)^{\frac{3(p+2)}{4(p-1)}}}{\left(1+\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\frac{2c_2}{c_1^2}\varepsilon_p^{\frac{3\beta}{4(2+\beta)}}\right)}\left(\frac{\left(1+\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\frac{2c_2}{c_1^2}\varepsilon_p^{\frac{3\beta}{4(2+\beta)}}\right)^2}{\left(1-d'_p\varepsilon_p^{\frac{1}{2+\beta}}\right)^{\frac{3(p+2)}{2(p-1)}}}-\frac{1}{\left(1+d'_p\varepsilon_p^{\frac{1}{2+\beta}}\right)^{\frac{3(p+2)}{2(p-1)}}}\right)\\ &\leq\frac{\left(1+\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\frac{2c_2}{c_1^2}\varepsilon_p^{\frac{3\beta}{4(2+\beta)}}\right)^2}{\left(1-d'_p\varepsilon_p^{\frac{1}{2+\beta}}\right)^{\frac{3(p+2)}{2(p-1)}}}-\frac{1}{\left(1+d'_p\varepsilon_p^{\frac{1}{2+\beta}}\right)^{\frac{3(p+2)}{2(p-1)}}}.\end{aligned}$$

To optimize the Hausdorff distance we set $\beta=\frac{4}{3}$. Observe that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon_p\to0^+}\frac{\frac{\left(1+\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\frac{2c_2}{c_1^2}\varepsilon_p^{\frac{3}{10}}\right)^2}{\left(1-d'_p\varepsilon_p^{\frac{3}{10}}\right)^{\frac{3(p+2)}{2(p-1)}}}-\frac{1}{\left(1+d'_p\varepsilon_p^{\frac{3}{10}}\right)^{\frac{3(p+2)}{2(p-1)}}}}{\varepsilon_p^{\frac{3}{10}}}=2\left(1+\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\frac{2c_2}{c_1^2}+\frac{3(p+2)}{2(p-1)}d'_p\right).$$

Define $\mathcal{E}:=T\mathcal{E}_{in}$, $\mathcal{D}:=T\mathcal{E}_{out}$ and $C_p:=3\left(1+\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\frac{2c_2}{c_1^2}+\frac{3(p+2)}{2(p-1)}d'_p\right)$. Therefore, choosing ε_p small enough implies the claim for $p>1$.

To complete the proof of the main Theorem we need to address the case $p=1$. We note that if

$$\frac{\Omega_1^3(K)}{8A(K)}>\pi^2(1-\varepsilon),$$

then for every $p>1$

$$\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K)}{2^{2+p}A^{2-p}(K)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}>\pi^2(1-\varepsilon).$$

This is because the function $p\mapsto\left(\frac{\Omega_p^{2+p}(K)}{2^{2+p}A^{2-p}(K)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ is increasing, [25]. Hence, to prove the stability of the affine isoperimetric inequality we can continue the argument for the stability of the p-affine isoperimetric inequality, for example with $p=2$. In this case $C_1=C_2$. The proof is now complete. □

Acknowledgment. I would like to thank Alina Stancu and Károly Böröczky for comments and suggestions that have improved the initial manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. B. Andrews, *Contraction of convex hypersurfaces by their affine normal*, J. Diff. Geom. **43**, 207–230, 1996.
2. B. Andrews, *Motion of hypersurfaces by Gauss curvature*, Pacific J. Math. **195**, No.1, 2000.
3. B. Andrews, *Singularities in crystalline curvature flows*, Asian J. Math. **6**, 101–121, 2002.
4. K. Ball, K.J. Böröczky, *Stability of the Prékope-Leindler inequality*, Mathematika, **56**, 339–356, 2010.
5. K. Ball, K.J. Böröczky, *Stability of some versions of the Prékopa-Leindler inequality*, Monatshefte für Mathematic, **163**, 1–14, 2011.
6. F. Barthe, K.J. Böröczky, M. Fradelizi, *Stability of the functional forms of the Blascke-Santaló inequality*, `arXiv:1206.0369v1 [math.MG]`.

7. W. Blaschke, *Über affine Geometrie I. Isoperimetrische Eigenschaften von Ellipse und Ellipsoid*, Leipz. Ber. **68**, 217–239, 1916.
8. K.J. Böröczky, D. Hug, *Stability of the reverse Blaschke-Santaló inequality for zonoids and applications*, Adv. Appl. Math. **44**, 309–328, 2010.
9. K.J. Böröczky, *The stability of the Rogers-Shephard inequality*, Adv. Math. **190**, 47–76, 2005.
10. K.J. Böröczky, *Stability of Blascke-Santaló inequality and the affine isoperimetric inequality*, Adv. Math. **225**, 1914–1928, 2010.
11. A. Cianchi, E. Lutwak, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *Affine Moser-Trudinger and Morrey-Sobolev inequalities*, Calc. Var. PDEs. **36**, 419–436, 2009.
12. V.I. Diskant, *Stability of the solution of a Minkowski equation*, Sibirsk. Mat. Zh. **14**, 669–673, 1973 (in Russian). Engl. transl.: Siberian Math. J. **14**, 466–473, 1974.
13. D. Hug, *Contributions to affine length*, Manuscripta Math. **91**, 283–301, 1996.
14. D. Hug, R. Schneider, *A stability result for volume ratio*, Israel J. Math. **161**, 209–219, 2007.
15. H. Groemer, *Stability of Geometric Inequalities*, Handbook of Convex Geometry, North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 125–150, 1993.
16. P.M. Gruber, *Asymptotic estimates for best and stepwise approximation of convex bodies II*, Forum de Mathématiques, **5**, 521-538, 1993.
17. P.M. Gruber, *Convex and Discrete Geometry*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften 336. Berlin: Springer, 2007.
18. M. N. Ivaki, *Centro-affine curvature flows on centrally symmetric convex curves*, to appear in J. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. `arXiv:1205.6456v2 [math.DG]`.
19. M. N. Ivaki, *A flow approach to the L_{-2} Minkowski problem*, to appear in Adv. Appl. Math. `arXiv:1205.6455v2 [math.DG]`.
20. F. John, *Extremum problems with inequalities as subsidiary conditions*, 187–204 in Studies and essays presented to R. Courant on his 60th birthday (Jan. 8, 1948), Interscience, New York, 1948.
21. M. Ludwig, M. Reitzner, *A classification of $SL(n)$ invariant valuations*, Ann. Math. **172**, 1223–1271, 2010.
22. M. Ludwig, *General affine length*, Adv. Math. **224**, 2346–2360, 2010.
23. E. Lutwak, V. Oliker, *On the regularity of solutions to a generalization of the Minkowski problem*, J. Diff. Geom. **41** 227–246, 1995.
24. E. Lutwak, *The BrunnMinkowskiFirey theory. I: Mixed volumes and the Minkowski problem*, J. Diff. Geom. **38** 131–150, 1993.
25. E. Lutwak, *The Brunn-Minkowski-Firey theory. II: Affine and geominimal surface areas*, Adv. Math. **118**, 244–294, 1996.
26. E. Lutwak, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *Optimal Sobolev norms and the L^p- Minkowski problem*, Int. Math. Res. Not. 2006, Art. ID 62987.
27. E. Lutwak, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *Sharp affine L_p Sobolev inequalities*, J. Diff. Geom. **62**, 17–38, 2002.
28. E. Lutwak, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *The Cramer-Rao inequality for star bodies*, Duke Math. J. **112**, 59–81, 2002.
29. E. Lutwak, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *L_p affine isoperimetric inequalities*, J. Diff. Geom. **56**, 111–132, 2000.
30. M. Meyer, E. Werner. *On the p-affine length*, Adv. Math. **152**, 288–313, 2000.
31. C.M. Petty, *Affine Isoperimetric Problems, Discrete Geometry and Convexity*, Eds.: J.E. Goodman, E. Lutwak, J. Malkevitch, R. Pollack, Proc. Conf. New York 1982. Annals New York Acad. Sci. **440**, 113–127, 1985.
32. C. Shütt and E. Werner, *Surface bodies and p-affine surface area*, Adv. Math. **187**, 98–145, 2004.
33. G. Sapiro and A. Tannenbaum, *On affine plane curve evolution*, J. Funct. Anal. **119**, 79–120, 1994.
34. A. Stancu, *The discrete planar L_0- Minkowski problem*, Adv. Math. **167**, 160–174, 2002.
35. A. Stancu, *On the number of solutions to the discrete two-dimensional L_0-Minkowski problem*, Adv. Math. **180**, 290–323, 2003.
36. A. Stancu, *Two volume product inequalities and their applications*, CMB **52**, 464–472, 2004.
37. A. Stancu, *The floating body problem*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **38**, 839–846, 2006.
38. A. Stancu, *The necessary condition for the discrete L_0-Minkowski problem in $\mathbb{R}^2$*, J. Geom. **88**, 162–168, 2008.

39. A. Stancu, *Centro-affine invariants for smooth convex bodies*, Int. Math. Res. Notices. doi: 10.1093/imrn/rnr110, 2011.
40. A. Stancu, *Some affine invariants revisited*, `arXiv:1208.0783v1 [math.FA]`.
41. N.S. Trudinger, X.J. Wang, *The Bernstein problem for affine maximal hypersurfaces*, Invent. Math. **140**, 399–422, 2000.
42. N.S. Trudinger, X.J. Wang, *Affine complete locally convex hypersurfaces*, Inven. Math. **150**, 45–60, 2002.
43. N.S. Trudinger, X.J. Wang, *The affine Plateau problem*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **18**, 253–289, 2005.
44. N.S. Trudinger, X.J. Wang, *Boundary regularity for the Monge-Ampère and affine maximal surface equations*, Ann. of Math. **167**, 993–1028, 2008.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Concordia University, Montreal, QC, Canada, H3G 1M8

E-mail address: `mivaki@mathstat.concordia.ca`